UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

YOLANDA	A HERREI	ERRERA,					
		Petitioner)	CIVIL	ACTION	NO.	05-10441-MLW
)				
	v.)				
)				
UNITED	STATES	OF AMERICA,)				
		Respondent)				
)				

Government's Motion To Substitute Exhibits In Support Of Its Memorandum

The United States of America, by Michael J. Sullivan, United States Attorney, and Michael J. Pelgro, Assistant U.S. Attorney, hereby files this motion to substitute exhibits in support of its memorandum in opposition to the petitioner's motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. The government requests that the Court consider the three exhibits attached to this motion instead of the three exhibits attached to the government's memorandum.

In support of this motion, the government states that, on December 5, 2005, it filed its memorandum in opposition to the petitioner's motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. The government attached to the memorandum three exhibits from the underlying criminal case. Certain exhibits, however, did not scan properly so that only the first page of the proposed exhibit was filed. The government has re-scanned the exhibits in their entirety.

The government therefore respectfully requests that the Court allow this motion to substitute the three exhibits attached to this motion instead of the three exhibits attached to the previously-filed memorandum.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL J. SULLIVAN United States Attorney

By: /s/Michael J. Pelgro
Michael J. Pelgro
Assistant U.S. Attorney

DATED: December 7, 2005.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that I have this day served upon the person listed below a copy of the foregoing document by depositing in the United States mail a copy of same in an envelope bearing sufficient postage for delivery:

Yolanda Herrera Inmate No. 23564-038 FCI Danbury Federal Correctional Institution Route 37 Danbury, CT 06811

This 7th day of December 2005.

/s/Michael J. Pelgro
MICHAEL J. PELGRO
ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED	STATES	OF	AMERIC	CA)	CR 01-10056	
)	Boston, MA	
v.)	September 10,	2002
)		
NELSON	RUDY T	EJED	A, ET	AL)		

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK L. WOLF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

(As previously noted.)

JUDITH A. TWOMEY, RPR
Official Court Reporter
One Courthouse Way
Courtroom 10~Room 5200
Boston, MA 02210
(617)946-2577



INDEX

2

WITNESS	DIRECT	CROSS	RD	RC	COURT
Joevanni Figueroa	94	107			
Linna Gonzalez	116	132			
Raphael Feliz Guevara	134	139			139
Awilda Osorio	140				

EXHIBITS	MARKED	RECEIVED
1		113
2		132
3		138

. .

25 1 MR. MURPHY: I agree with the court's 2 calculations, your Honor. THE COURT: Once I make that determination, 3 I'll calculate the Guidelines for Hector A. Arias. 4 5 MR. MURPHY: Thank you. THE COURT: I believe -- has any agreement been 6 7 reached with regard to Ms. Herrera? MR. PELGRO: Yes, your Honor. The parties --8 9 the defendant has agreed to the government's figure of 10 one to three kilograms of heroin, putting her at base offense level 32. The government is not opposing her 11 12 request for a safety valve reduction. Originally, the government had indicated in the 13 14 plea agreement that she should get a role enhancement. However, upon reflection, the government thinks 15 Probation has the better analysis of this and is not 16 17 pressing that. The government is agreeing to no role enhancement or reduction. And the government is again 18 19 dropping its obstruction objection, which brings into play the acceptance reduction. 20

> So, essentially, your Honor, there are no further factual issues. It would be 32 minus 2 minus 3. THE COURT:

27.

Mr. Budreau, have you and Ms. Herrera each read the presentence report?

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BUDREAU: Absolutely, your Honor.

THE COURT: More precisely, was it read to her in Spanish?

MR. BUDREAU: It was, your Honor, as well as the addendum.

THE COURT: Ms. Herrera, please stand. Was the presentence report and the objections in the back of it read to you in Spanish?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes

THE COURT: And other than the original objections, is there anything that you saw in there that you thought was incorrect that might make a difference to sentencing?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Now, I was just told that you now agree that you should be held responsible for one to three kilograms of heroin rather than 100 to 400 grams as --

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And, also, rather than the 3,146 grams found by Probation, which would have raised your sentence if it was proven, you agree to one to 300, is that right -- I'm sorry, one to three kilograms -- is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Ah hah.

THE COURT: You have to say yes or no.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Did you discuss with Mr. Budreau whether you wanted to make that agreement and give up your objection claiming one to 400 grams?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you fully satisfied with his work as your lawyer in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Once again, I'm going to accept that agreement. I think there is, from what I saw, overwhelming evidence that there's at least one to three kilograms involved. The real question is whether the defendant would be held responsible for more than three kilograms as recommended by Probation. But it's only another 146 or 147 grams. Some reasonable approximations are permissible. This was the result of reasonable arm's length negotiations, and I will accept -- I will accept that.

The Guidelines then, I believe, as Mr. Pelgro just said, give us a total offense level of 27, which means the range of imprisonment is 70 to 87 months, because the criminal history category is 1.

I guess we have the same issue of whether it's 36 or 60 months supervised release.

What is the fine range? I'll ask Probation officer to identify herself for the record.

FROM THE FLOOR: Jennifer Sinclair. 12,500 to one million at a level 27.

THE COURT: 12,500 to one million is the fine range, and a \$100 special assessment.

Do counsel agree that those are the Guideline ranges?

MR. PELGRO: Yes, your Honor.

MR. BUDREAU: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You may be seated.

MR. BUDREAU: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has any agreement been reached with regard to Ms. Gonzalez? Actually, maybe we ought to wait until Mr. Dilday arrives.

MR. PELGRO: I was just going to say that it's pretty much as set forth in the chart. There weren't any disagreements.

THE COURT: There were no disagreements?

MR. PELGRO: There's just one issue, your

Honor, that relates to the safety valve. As indicated
earlier, the government believes that Ms. Gonzalez has
met the fifth criterion of the proffer. However, there
is an issue concerning criminal history as to whether or
not she has more than one point, and that's all stated

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) CR 01-10056
) Boston, MA
v.) September 11, 2002
)
NELSON RUDY TEJEDA. ET AL)

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK L. WOLF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

(As previously noted.)

JUDITH A. TWOMEY, RPR
Official Court Reporter
One Courthouse Way
Courtroom 10~Room 5200
Boston, MA 02210
(617)946-2577



INDEX

2

WITNESS DIRECT CROSS RD RC COURT

Jose Cruz 58

EXHIBITS MARKED RECEIVED

13 30
14 33

there and tell everybody what a miserable experience you had, maybe the rest of your life will be happier than your life to date.

If you don't learn anything from this, including there are times when it doesn't make sense to obey your parents when they're encouraging you to break the law, you're going to spend the rest of your life in prison.

You may be seated.

Next we go to Ms. Herrera.

If I understand it correctly, there are no remaining disputes concerning Ms. Herrera. The parties are in agreement, and I've accepted the agreement that this involves one to three kilograms of cocaine. Safety valve has been satisfied. The government has withdrawn its objection concerning obstruction of justice, and there's a three level reduction for acceptance of responsibility.

MR. PELGRO: That's correct, your Honor.

However, I think you said cocaine.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I meant heroin.

MR. PELGRO: That's correct.

THE COURT: Let's look at the objections so I can make the proper endorsements.

The first objection is accommodated in the plea

agreement concerning acceptance of responsibility. 1 2 The second objection regarding weight, the government says should be 1,000 to 3,000 grams. That's 3 allowed. 4 The third objection is taken care of by the 5 earlier rulings. So is the fourth, I believe. 6 7 Is that all correct, Mr. Pelgro? MR. PELGRO: Yes, your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: With regard to the first of the defendant's objections, am I correct, Mr. Budreau, that 10 11 the defendant now agrees, as I was told previously, that the proper amount is one to 3,000 grams. 12 MR. BUDREAU: That's correct, your Honor. 13 think page 9 is the second objection. 14 THE COURT: Objection 2, with the agreement of 15 16 the government, is allowed. That relates to 17 obstruction. MR. BUDREAU: Page 12 is the third objection. 18 19 THE COURT: The third objection concerning 20 acceptance of responsibility is also allowed. Objection 4, I think, requires a ruling, is 21 22 that right? 23 MR. BUDREAU: Correct. 24 THE COURT: Objection 5, I think, requires no

ruling.

25

And 6 appears to be the same, is that right?

MR. BUDREAU: That's right, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. In view of all of that, as I understand it, the total offense level is 27, criminal history category is 1, Guidelines are 70 to 87 months, 60 months supervised release, a fine range of 12,500 to \$1 million, and a \$100 special assessment.

Do the parties agree?

MR. BUDREAU: Yes, we do.

MR. PELGRO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: What is the government's recommendation and what are the reasons for it?

MR. PELGRO: Your Honor, the government is recommending a sentence of 87 months incarceration, five years supervised release, and I'll leave the issue of the fine to the court's discretion, and a special assessment.

The reason, your Honor, is as follows. This defendant, although not as out front as her -- as the two men in her life, played a vitally important role to the success of the conspiracy, and I would point your Honor's attention to two groups of evidence. The wiretap evidence really is what made the case against this particular defendant, and what it showed was daily contact between Ms. Herrera and Mr. Hector B. Arias and

Ms. Herrera and Hector A. Arias. In fact, she was often the intermediary between those two strong-willed persons. But what her job really was, as Linna Gonzalez testified, was keeping track of how much product they had on hand, how much they had mixed this to make the distributor quantities of heroin, how much money they had on hand, and how much they were going to need to pay the supplier for the next quantity of heroin.

That came through loud and clear on the wiretap evidence, as set forth in the presentence report, that she was the person who was the bookkeeper, if you will, the financial recordkeeper, the person that made sure this was a profitable venture, and they weren't losing money instead of making money.

Again, the only other piece of evidence, your Honor, would be Ms. Gonzalez's testimony that in addition to that she -- in addition to those roles -- and Mrs. Gonzalez testified that Ms. Herrera was the person who would keep track of everything in notebooks, would issue out the money, make sure everyone was getting the correct money, but she would -- she was also the person who would help in preparing the heroin for distribution. She would bag it. She would get some of the things needed to bag the heroin.

So, to the government's way of thinking, that

was a vitally important role to the success of the conspiracy.

I would add, your Honor, like the other persons in this conspiracy, she has no drug issues. She's not a heroin addict. This is purely a profit venture for her.

She entered the country illegally. She was living in section 8 housing. She allowed her husband to live there illegally. She was using a fake ID, fake Social Security number. All of those things, your Honor, with regard to the other defendants, equally apply to this defendant. And, essentially, that would be the reason, your Honor.

MR. BUDREAU: Your Honor, James Budreau on behalf of Ms. Herrera. Ms. Herrera did come to the country in 1991. Prior to that, she lived in the Dominican Republic, like her husband, but she had lived in pretty much what we would call abject poverty. She had lost her family home, as well as some properties, as a result of her brother, who had lost some money in some situation. But she lived in abject poverty. She had three children -- has three children in the Dominican Republic. She's 47 years old. She lived in Massachusetts. She did work while she was in Massachusetts. She worked as a seamstress, and she worked for a flower factory. She's a person who did put

her hands to the grindstone in that respect in

Massachusetts while she was here. She did get involved.

She obviously has accepted responsibility for that.

I think the evidence, to some degree,

demonstrates the control that her husband had over the

family and that she is also one of those people. She

accepts complete responsibility for what she did, as Mr.

Pelgro outlined. But I do think that it's pretty

evident, this was not a house of feminism. This is a

house where Boogie ruled the ruse. She was a cog in the

machine. No question about it, she did some awful

things, no question about it.

I think there's one thing that distinguishes her from the rest of the family beyond the evidence that we have discussed and, that is, she did do a safety valve proffer, and I think that's important for a couple of reasons. One is she stood up and said, I did wrong, and this is what I did. And she's a person who had the force to point the finger at her common law husband and say things about him, as well as her son. Those are tremendously difficult things for anybody to do, especially since she had been in the shadow of her common law husband and, as the report shows, the PSR shows, he was a relatively abusive person, not only to her son, but to her. And while she didn't cower in the

corner, and this is not one of any PTSD or anything like that, it does demonstrate that this man had a lot of power over her. When she was out of the shadow, she stood up and said, I take responsibility, and said, this is what everybody did in this organization. While she didn't testify against anyone, that still does not mean she didn't take that sort of step and didn't take herself out of the shadow of her husband. It shows she's going to change her ways and be a different person when she is released and goes back to her children in the Dominican Republic.

I would ask the court to consider all that and ask the court to give her a sentence at the low end of the Guidelines, which would be 70 months.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Herrera, you have an opportunity to speak before I decide what sentence to impose. You do not have to say anything if you don't want to. But if there's anything you would like to say, this is the time.

THE DEFENDANT: First of all, I want to apologize to you and to the government of the United States and to God. I have already asked God for forgiveness, because I am sorry. And that's all. Thank you.

(Short pause.)

THE COURT: Ms. Herrera, please stand.

In connection with the one count to which you've pled guilty, I hereby sentence you to serve 87 months in the custody of the Attorney General of the United States, to be followed by 60 months of supervised release on the standard conditions and on the additional conditions that you pay a hundred thousand dollar fine, that you not possess a firearm or other dangerous weapon, and that if ordered deported you leave immediately and not return without the authorization of the Attorney General.

You have a limited right to appeal. You gave up some of your rights to appeal in your presentence report. I believe you still retain whatever rights you would ordinarily -- well, you have the right to appeal in the plea agreement. You may have given up your right to appeal the decisions I've made. But, in any event, if you want to appeal, you should assume you have the right to appeal. Notice of appeal has to be filed within ten days of the entry of judgment. If you'd like to try to pursue an appeal within the limits left to you by the plea agreement, but do not have the money to afford a lawyer, one will be appointed for you at public expense.

Fundamentally, the reasons for this decision are as follows. 87 months is at the high end of what is said to be the reasonable range, but nobody asked that you get an upward adjustment like your common law husband and your son for your role in the offense and, if I had been asked, I might have granted it, because you played a management role in this scheme.

You bear a responsibility to your son being here and -- some responsibility for your son being here, for Ms. Gonzalez being here, for everybody else being here. And it is good that you made that safety valve proffer, but you got a two level reduction in your Guidelines for doing that.

But, fundamentally, you know, you're a person like Boogie who was able to do honest work in the Dominican Republic and here. You are a seamstress. You worked in a flower shop. But you decided or at least agreed to do heroin instead. And it has a horrible effect on people. If you didn't know that before, you certainly should understand it, having sat here the last three days. And, you know, you came to this country illegally. You were given subsidized housing, paid for in part by the government of the United States. And instead of taking advantage of the opportunity you legally obtained to do honest work, you did dishonest,

dangerous work.

Now you have -- frankly, the way the sentencing laws work at the moment, I don't have the power to give you a sentence that's as high as Andy's, but it's hard for me to explain why you're not going to prison at least as long as him. But you're not.

So you're likely to be the first one sent back to the Dominican Republic. And if this has been a miserable experience for you, I hope you'll tell everybody you meet so they won't be tempted to come here, try to do the same thing, and have the same miserable experience.

You may be seated.

MR. BUDREAU: Your Honor, if I might ask, I don't know if it's an appropriate request for counsel for the Ariases to leave at this point. If it's not, certainly, we'll --

THE COURT: We're going to break for lunch shortly.

MR. BUDREAU: Fine, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's one of the issues we'll have to discuss.

Who is it -- Mr. Cullen made arrangements not to have to be anyplace else this afternoon. Who else?

MR. PALMER: Attorney Palmer for Mr. Ortiz. I

Page 1 of 1

Case 1:01-cr-10056-MLW

Document 430 Filed 06/23/2004

United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

No. 02-2298

UNITED STATES,

Appellee,

ν.

YOLANDA HERRERA,

Defendant, Appellant.

Before

Boudin, Chief Judge, Lipez and Howard, Circuit Judges.

JUDGMENT

Entered: May 27, 2004

We review for plain error, in light of appellant's concession that she did not object below to the fine imposed by the district court.

Appellant has addressed only one of the four components of the plain error test. See <u>United States</u> v. <u>Rowe</u>, 268 F.3d 34, 38 (1st Cir. 2001). Our review of the record below shows that it is adequate for appellate review and that there is no plain error. <u>See United States</u> v. <u>Lujan</u>, 324 F.3d 27, 35 (1st Cir. 2003).

The judgment is affirmed. 1st Cir. R. 27(c).

Certified and Issued as Mandate under Fed. R. App. P. 41.

By the Court:

Richard Cushing Donovan, Clerk

Richard Cushing Donovan, Clerk.

By:____JULIE GREGG

Appeals Attorney

[cc: Dina Chaitowitz, AUSA, Virginia Vander Jagt, AUSA, Darla Jean Mondou, Esq.)

